

ORIGINAL

Original



0000131642

Raye Stiles

2018 N. Tucker Dr.

Tucson, AZ 85716

RECEIVED

2011 NOV 10 A 9:10

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

NOV 10 2011

Docket No. T-01051B-11-0351

RAYE STILES,

Complainant,

v.

Qwest,

Respondent.

DOCKETED BY

[Signature]

MOTION TO CONTINUE
PROCEDURAL HEARING; and,
MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION
OF ORDER

Complainant, Raye Stiles, moves this body to continue the procedural hearing until such time as she can appear, or, in the alternative, is at a place where she can participate in a telephonic hearing without causing her a financial hardship.

Complainant is ill, and due to other proceedings, was unable to keep several important doctor's appointments, including, but not limited to, outpatient surgery.

Additionally, her mother became ill, and Complainant had unforeseen financial demands.

Because Ms. Stiles must have telephone service due to her health problems, she has a telephone which charges by the minute, and cannot at this time participate in a teleconference, no matter how short. She also has to keep sufficient minutes so that her mother or her mother's doctor may contact Ms. Stiles in case of emergency.¹

Complainant also moves for clarification of order as to unlawful practice of law. She does not have internet, so she is unable to check the authority cited. And, she is perplexed as to why

¹ Ms. Stiles had to replenish her phone minutes twice in one week in October, 2011, due to her mother's emergency health problems, both times required transport via ambulance.

UPL was referenced. Ms. Stiles, therefore, needs to know and understand exactly what the administrative law judge is referencing and why. It is her understanding that, as long as a person is representing themselves, there is no UPL. However, if Complainant has misconstrued the statute, she would respectfully request that it be explained to her so that there is no misunderstanding.

WHEREFORE, Complainant respectfully requests that her motion to continue be granted until the first week in December, 2011, and that her motion for clarification be granted.

DATED this the 8th day of November, 2011.

Respectfully Submitted,

151 Raye Stiles
Raye Stiles, Complainant, Pro Se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this the 8th day of November, 2011, I forwarded a true and correct copy of the foregoing “ *MOTION TO CONTINUE PROCEDURAL HEARING; and, MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF ORDER* ” to Respondents by depositing same into the United States mail, postage fully prepaid, to the parties named below, addressed as follows:

Norman G. Cutright
Associate General Counsel
20 E. Thomas Road, 1st Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85012

By:


Raye Stiles